

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 are pending. The Office Action dated December 21, 2007 in this Application has been carefully considered, and the accompanying amendments and remarks have been undertaken with a view toward placing this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 15, and 20 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview conducted on March 19, 2008. During the interview, the above amendments and following remarks were discussed. The Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed clarifying some elements within the claims to better distinguish the novel aspect of the invention. Examiner noted that a further limitation of Claim 1, with the clarification of some elements, could patentably distinguish Applicant's invention from the art currently of record. However, the Examiner indicated that such agreement was subject to completion of additional search and further consideration of any material references found. Since the Examiner wished to expedite examination following completion of any additional search, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues raised or remaining.

Claims 1-3 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,970,924 to Chu ("Chu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,225,272 to Kelley et al ("Kelley"). In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, "receiving, by the UE, the reverse domain query comprising the visited serving network domain name"; "extracting, by the UE, the

serving network domain name from the received reverse domain name query”; “generating, by the UE, an application server name”; and further “appending, by the UE, the extracted serving network domain name to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name.” (Emphasis added). Support for these amendments can be found in, among other places, pages 7, line 30 to page 8, line 5, and page 8, lines 1-5 and 20-31 of the application as originally filed.

Regarding Claim 1, Chu was cited for its purported disclosure of a method of determining an Internet Protocol (IP) address of an application server of a serving network, comprising receiving an IP address by a user equipment (UE); performing a reverse domain name query by the UE as a function of the received IP address; receiving, by the UE, a response from the visited serving network to the reverse domain name query; deriving, by the UE, serving network domain name information from the reverse domain name query; appending, by the UE, derived serving network domain name information to an application server name; performing, by the UE, a domain query as a function of the domain specific application server name; and receiving, by the UE, a second IP address as a function of the domain-specific application server name. The Examiner acknowledged that Chu does not teach the limitation of “generating a domain-specific application server name.” However, the Examiner cited Kelley for its purported disclosure of the generation of a domain-specific application server name. The Examiner further stated that Kelly discloses a method wherein parsed pieces of a reference may be used to dynamically generate a canonical name. In addition, the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill to combine Chu and Kelley because the modification of Chu by Kelley would lead to a combination wherein the derived serving network domain name information may be appended dynamically to generate a domain-specific application server name.

However, neither Chu nor Kelley suggest, teach, nor disclose the unique combination of “receiving, by the UE, the reverse domain query comprising the visited serving network domain name”; “extracting, by the UE, the serving network domain name from the received reverse domain name query”; “generating, by the UE, an application server name”; and further “appending, by the UE, the extracted serving network domain name to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name.” (Emphasis added). Specifically, Kelley teaches parsing a reference such as “isp.ext.jsmith.pages1.ns.joe.ext” into separate parts and further combining the parsed separate parts, such as the “isp.ext” and “jsmith.pages1”, and combining those parts to generate a “canonical name” such as “jsmith.pages1.isp.ext”. See Kelley at Col 7, line 43 to Col 8, line 14. Therefore, combining the parsed separate parts to generate a “canonical name” does not teach, suggest, nor disclose the unique combination of Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited references do not teach the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over these references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Rejected independent Claim 20 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, “extract the serving network domain name information from the reverse domain name query; generate an application server name; and further “store the second IP address.” Support for this amendment can be found in, among other places, pages 7, line 30 to page 8, line 5 and page 8, lines 1-5 and 14-31 of the application as originally filed.

Applicant contends that the rejection of amended Claim 20 is overcome for at least some of the reasons by which the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Chu nor Kelley disclosing, teaching, or suggesting “receiving, by the UE, the reverse domain query comprising the visited serving network domain name”; “extracting, by the UE, the serving network domain name from the received reverse domain name query”; “generating, by the UE, an application server name”; “appending, by the UE, the extracted serving network domain name to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name”; and further “store the second IP address.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claim 20 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in any combination.

Claims 2-3 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 2-3 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of dependent Claim 2-3 also be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of Official Notice. In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 4-6 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claim 4-6 also be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 15 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, “extract the serving network domain name information from the reverse domain name query”; “generate an application server name,” and “append the extracted derived serving network domain name information to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name.” (Emphasis added.) Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, page 7, line 30 to page 8, line 5; page 8, lines 1-5 and 20-31, of the Application as originally filed.

Applicant contends that the rejection of amended Claim 15 is overcome for at least some of the reasons by which the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome. These reasons include neither Chu nor the Official Notice disclosing, teaching, or suggesting “receiving, by the UE, the reverse domain query comprising the visited serving network domain name”; “extracting, by the UE, the serving network domain name from the received reverse domain name query”; “generating, by the UE, an application server name”; and further “appending, by the UE, the extracted serving network domain name to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name.” (Emphasis added.) Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claim 15 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in proffered combination with Official Notice. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and Claim 15 be allowed.

Claims 16-19 depend from and further limit Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 15 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 16-19 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 16-19 also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and distinguishing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-6 and 15-20 as presented herein.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner have any concern or uncertainty as to any of the foregoing amendments or remarks, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: March 20, 2008  
CARR LLP  
670 Founders Square  
900 Jackson Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: (214) 760-3030  
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/  
Gregory W. Carr  
Reg. No. 31,093